

## **REMARKS**

In view of the above amendments and following remarks, reconsideration of the objections and rejections contained in the Office Action of November 29, 2007 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner objected to the specification and the claims in sections 1 and 2 on page 2 of the Office Action. Objection to the specification is remedied by the Preliminary Amendment, it is noted. The objections to the claims, to the extent appropriate, are remedied by the above amendments to the claims.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-11 as being indefinite, objecting to the discussion of the inspection-use board in independent claims 1, 6, 7 and 11. With regard to claim 11, the rejection has been rendered moot. Independent claims 1 and 6 remain, and claims 9 and 10 have been redrafted into independent form so as to include the subject matter of claim 7. The Examiner's rejection will be discussed in the context of these claims.

The Examiner questions why the material of the inspection-use board has different properties on its surfaces. It is initially noted that why an element of a claim may have certain properties bears no relation to the definiteness of the claim. The purpose of the claim is to specify the scope of protection for the invention with sufficient definiteness so that those of ordinary skill in the art will be apprised of the scope of the claim and know what they can make and use, and what they cannot. The claims, at least as amended above, accomplish this.

The Examiner states that if the inspection-use board is formed from a light transmitting material then it should have both identical surfaces partially transmitting light and partially reflecting light equally on both of the surfaces, or if the board has a reflecting surface disposed in a surface opposed to its component mounting side surface, meaning the surfaces are different from each other in optical properties, then some limitation should point out such difference between the surfaces. The Examiner's concern, it must be admitted, is not entirely understood. It appears that the claims more than adequately described the nature of the inspection-use board.

Turning to claim 1, the claim is a method claim which recites mounting of the component “on a component mounting side-surface of an inspection-use board which is formed from a light transmitting material and which has a reflecting surface disposed on a surface opposed to the component mounting side-surface and facing the component mounting side-surface.” In other words, the board is made of a light transmitting material, has a reflecting surface opposed to the component mounting surface, and the reflecting surface faces the component mounting surface. Thus, the claim seems completely clear in reciting the nature of the board.

Turning to the specification, for example, noting Fig. 10, board 7 has a component mounting side-surface 7a in which the jig component 5 is mounted as an electric component. As described on page 38 of the original specification, it is made of a light transmitting material. As further described on page 38, a reflecting surface 8a is applied onto the surface that is opposed to the component mounting side-surface 7a so as to face the surface 7a. Thus, the language of claim 1, with respect to the example of Fig. 10 at least, is completely correct in describing the nature of the board. The language used is definite with respect to the properties, and clearly serves to apprise one of ordinary skill in the art as to the scope of the claim.

Turning to claim 6, it can be seen that the same language is used in the first step of the claim. Turning to prior claim 7, similar language is again used. The language is correct, corresponds to what is described in the specification, and indicates the salient details of the board. It is not seen what more could be required for definiteness and compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claims 7, 8 and 11 as being unpatentable over Ito. These claims have now been canceled. Claims 9 and 10 have now been drafted into independent form. These claims were indicated as being allowable if so-rewritten. Similarly, claims 1-6 have been amended to address the relevant objections raised by the Examiner. Accordingly, it is submitted that all of the claims that are now pending in the application are clearly in condition for allowance, and indication of such is respectfully requested.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and the Examiner is requested to pass the case to issue. If the Examiner should have any comments or suggestions to help speed the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's undersigned representative.

Respectfully submitted,

Kazunobu SAKAI

By: 

Nils E. Pedersen

Registration No. 33,145

Attorney for Applicant

NEP/nka  
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021  
Telephone (202) 721-8200  
Facsimile (202) 721-8250  
February 29, 2008